

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended, claim 9 is canceled and new claim 12 is added.

No new matter is added to the application by this Amendment. Support for features added to claim 1 can be found within the specification, as originally filed, at, for example, page 2, lines 14-16. New claim 12 finds support in claim 1, as originally filed, and within the specification, as originally filed, at, for example, page 22, lines 10-12.

Entry of the claim amendments and reconsideration of the application are thus respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the cancelation of claim 9, this rejection is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

II. Claim Objection

Claim 9 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as alleged being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

In view of the cancelation of claim 9, this objection is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the claim.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and/or §103

Claims 1-9 and 11 were rejected (a) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0202881 to Everaerts et al. (hereinafter “Everaerts”), and (b) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Everaerts, and optionally U.S. Patent No. 6,551,439 to Hill, IV et al. (hereinafter “Hill”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In view of the cancelation of claim 9, these rejections are moot with respect to that claim.

The Patent Office alleges that Everaerts teaches or suggests each and every feature of claims. Alternatively, the Patent Office acknowledges that (i) Applicant's elected species is not disclosed, (ii) arguably Applicant's refractive index is not inherent in the adhesive of Everaerts and (iii) arguably no diblock copolymer is present in Everaert's examples. The Patent Office alleges (a) that choice of Applicant's components from the reference would have been obvious to a practitioner having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in the expectation of adequate results absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results, (b) Everaerts discloses the adherences of two glass plates with their adhesive for testing purposes, (c) Everaerts discloses that the materials of their examples were tested by application to a “glass test plate” and “glass or polyethylene substrates”, (d) Everaerts meets the limitation of adherence to a first and second optically transparent substrate in that glass is transparent, and (e) that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to adhere two glass plates together as taught by Everaerts for testing purposes absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results. Applicants respectfully disagree with the allegations

regarding Everaerts.

With respect to Hill, the Patent Office alleges that Hill discloses that adherence of clear labels to clear containers is very desirable to consumers and that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to adhere two transparent materials together using the adhesive of Everaerts as taught by Hill motivated by the disclosure of the primary reference of an adhesive that is to be used as labelstock and by the disclosure of the secondary reference that adherence of labels to transparent containers is especially desirable absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results. Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Patent Office's allegations regarding Hill.

Contrary to the Patent Office's allegations, Everaerts teaches a hot-melt processable adhesive may be applied to a substrate, [such as, sheeting products (i.e., decorative, reflective, and graphical), borders of medical electrodes and drug deliver patches, labelstock, tape backings] or any suitable type of material depending on the desired application (see paragraph [0118]). Everaerts also discloses that the substrate, typically, comprises a nonwoven, woven, foam, paper, polypropylene (e.g., biaxially oriented polypropylene (BOPP)), polyethylene, polyester (e.g., polyethylene terephthalate), or release liner (e.g., siliconized liner) (see paragraph [0118]).

However, Everaerts teaches that the adhesive may be between a substrate to which film or coating is to be adhered and a surface capable of releasing the adhesive film or coating to form a composite structure or between two release surfaces and cooled to form an adhesive transfer tape useful in laminating applications (see paragraph [0121]). Thus, Everaerts teaches, at best, a release surface bonded to (i) a substrate (transparent or non-transparent) or (ii) another release surface.

With respect to Everaerts' test methods and contrary to the Patent Office's

allegations, Everaerts teaches a strip of the adhesive coated sheet may be applied to a horizontal surface of a single clean glass test plate to perform a 180° Peel Strength test (see paragraph [0134] and [0135]). Thus, nowhere does Everaerts teach or suggest a pressure-sensitive adhesive system comprising a first optically transparent substrate bonded to a second optically transparent substrate with pressure-sensitive adhesive, wherein the first and second optically transparent substrates are optically active liquid-crystal-based display films as required by amended claim 1.

Hill teaches (1) a UV curable PSA may adhere a clear or transparent label in a uniform fashion to a clear container and (2) uniform attachment of clear or transparent labels to clear containers, e.g., clear glass or plastic beer and soda bottles, is very desirable, providing a very clean finish, and also permitting the product inside the bottle to be clearly and easily viewed through the label (see col. 1, lines 8-10 and 40-45).

Applicants submit that Hill fails to remedy the deficiencies of Everaerts because Hill also does not teach or suggest a first optically active transparent liquid-crystal-based display film bonded to a second optically active transparent liquid-crystal-based display film with pressure-sensitive adhesive. Thus, Everaerts and Hill, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest a pressure-sensitive adhesive system comprising a first optically transparent substrate bonded to a second optically transparent substrate with pressure-sensitive adhesive, wherein the first and second optically transparent substrates are optically active liquid-crystal-based display films as required by claim 1.

Because the above-identified features of independent claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Everaerts and Hill, taken singly or in combination, these references would not have rendered the features of independent claims 1 and its dependent claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-8 and 11 are patentable over the Everaerts and Hill. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and/or §103 are respectfully requested.

IV. New Claim

Applicants take this opportunity to submit that none of the cited references, taken singly or in combination, teaches or suggests a pressure-sensitive adhesive system comprising a first optically transparent pane of glass bonded to a second optically transparent pane of glass with pressure-sensitive adhesive as required by new claim 12.

Therefore, new claim 12 is patentably distinct from and non-obvious over the cited references.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8, 11 and 12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account
No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /Brian C. Anscomb/
 Brian C. Anscomb
 Reg. No. 48,641
 875 Third Avenue, 18th Floor
 New York, New York 10022
 Phone: (212) 808-0700
 Fax: (212) 808-0844